PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

From the INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY To: WRITTEN OPINION OF THE see form PCT/ISA/220 INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY (PCT Rule 43bis.1) Date of mailing (day/month/year) see form PCT/ISA/210 (second sheet) FOR FURTHER ACTION Applicant's or agent's file reference See paragraph 2 below see form PCT/ISA/220 Priority date (day/month/year) International filing date (day/month/year) International application No. 30.07.2003 28.07.2004 PCT/GB2004/003242 International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC C02F1/44 Applicant UNIVERSITY OF SURREY This opinion contains indications relating to the following items: 1. ☑ Box No. I Basis of the opinion Box No. II Priority Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability Box No. III Lack of unity of invention □ Box No. IV Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial ☑ Box No. V applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement Certain documents cited ☐ Box No. VI 26 Jen 2008 Certain defects in the international application ☐ Box No. VII ☑ Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application **FURTHER ACTION** 2. If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will usually be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA"). However, this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notifed the International Bureau under Rule 66.1 bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered. If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of three months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later. For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/220. For further details, see notes to Form PCT/ISA/220. Authorized Officer Name and mailing address of the ISA:



European Patent Office D-80298 Munich

Tel. +49 89 2399 - 0 Tx: 523656 epmu d

Fax: +49 89 2399 - 4465

.

Goers, B

Telephone No. +49 89 2399-7343



WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No. PCT/GB2004/003242

	Box N	<u> </u>	Basis of the opinion
1.	the lan	guag	to the language , this opinion has been established on the basis of the international application in je in which it was field, unless otherwise indicated under this item.
	laı (u	ngua nder	Rules 12.3 and 23.1(b)).
2.	With re	egaro sary t	I to any nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence disclosed in the international application and to the claimed invention, this opinion has been established on the basis of:
	a. type	of n	naterial:
		a s	equence listing
		tabl	le(s) related to the sequence listing
	b _: forn	nat o	f material:
		in v	vritten format
		in c	computer readable form
	c. time	of fi	ling/furnishing:
		cor	ntained in the international application as filed.
		file	d together with the international application in computer readable form.
		fur	nished subsequently to this Authority for the purposes of search.
3	h	as be opies	lition, in the case that more than one version or copy of a sequence listing and/or table relating thereto een filed or furnished, the required statements that the information in the subsequent or additional is is identical to that in the application as filed or does not go beyond the application as filed, as priate, were furnished.
	8	امسما	comments:

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No. PCT/GB2004/003242

	Box No. II Priority	<u> </u>		
— 1.	□ The following document has	s not been furnished	:	
				d (Rule 43 <i>bis</i> .1 and 66.7(a)).
				claimed (Rule 43 <i>bis</i> .1 and 66.7(b)).
			in the validity of the	priority claim. This opinion has ate is the claimed priority date.
2.		olished as if no prior	ity had been claimed 1. Thus for the purpos	due to the fact that the priority clain ses of this opinion, the international
3.	Additional observations, if neces			
	Box No. V Reasoned staten industrial applicability; citation	nent under Rule 43	<i>bis</i> .1(a)(i) with regans supporting such	rd to novelty, inventive step or statement
_				
1.	Statement Statement			
1.		Yes: Claims No: Claims	1-22	
1.	Statement	Yes: Claims		
1.	Statement Novelty (N)	Yes: Claims No: Claims Yes: Claims	1-22	
1.	Statement Novelty (N) Inventive step (IS)	Yes: Claims No: Claims Yes: Claims No: Claims Yes: Claims	1-22 1-22	
	Statement Novelty (N) Inventive step (IS)	Yes: Claims No: Claims Yes: Claims No: Claims Yes: Claims	1-22 1-22	

The following observations on the clarity of the claims, description, and drawings or on the question whether the claims are fully supported by the description, are made:

see separate sheet

Re Item V.

1 The following documents are referred to in this communication:

D1: US 5 281.430 A (HERRON JOHN R ET AL) 25 January 1994 (1994-01-25)

D2: US 3 532 621 A (HOUGH WILLIAM THOMAS) 6 October 1970 (1970-10-06)

D3: WO 97/18166 A (OSMOTEK INC) 22 May 1997 (1997-05-22)

D4: US 4 781 837 A (LEFEBVRE MICHEL S M) 1 November 1988 (1988-11-01)

D5: WO 99/39799 A (MCGINNIS ROBERT L) 12 August 1999 (1999-08-12)

The principle of the direct or forward osmosis process is well known in the art. Documents D1-D5 are examples of typical embodiments and applications. It is an compulsory feature that the membrane is dense for the respective solutes used on the permeate side (which are known as "osmotic agents"). Thus the pore size is directly dependent on the osmotic agent used i.e. if the osmotic agent in the prior art is the same as in the application, the pore size is also implicitly disclosed.

2 Novelty

The present application does not meet the criteria of Article 33(1) PCT, because the subject-matter of claims 1-22 is not novel.

2.1 The present application does not meet the criteria of Article 33(1) PCT, because the subject-matter of **claims 1-18, 21 and 22** is not new in the sense of Article 33(2) PCT in the light of D4.

Document D4 discloses (the references in parenthesis applying to this document): A process for the desalination of seawater comprising a membrane module for osmotic distillation with a MgSO₄ osmotic agent second solution circulated in a recycle loop comprising a reverse osmosis extraction step (fig. 2). It is implicitly given, that the pressure resulting from the osmotic distillation increases the driving force of the reverse osmosis process.

Fig. 1 shows a different embodiment (fruit juice concentration), where seawater is used as second solution. Seawater comprises both MgSO₄ and NaCl.

2.2 The present application does not meet the criteria of Article 33(1) PCT, because the subject-matter of **claims 1-5, 7-13, 17 and 20-22** is not new in the sense of Article 33(2) PCT in the light of D1.

Document D1 discloses (the references in parenthesis applying to this document):

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY (SEPARATE SHEET)

PCT/GB2004/003242

A process for direct osmosis concentration of products with sucrose, fructose or glucose as osmotic agents (col. 10, ll 40-44). In the recycling loop an evaporation step is foreseen (fig, 3).

Example 4 further discloses the use of an anti-fouling and anti-scaling agent (Ultrasil).

- 2.3 The present application does not meet the criteria of Article 33(1) PCT, because the subject-matter of claims 1-4, 7-17, 19, 21 and 22 is not new in the sense of Article 33(2) PCT in the light of D3. Document D3 discloses (the references in parenthesis applying to this document): A direct osmosis process using salt or sugar as osmotic agents (p. 7, Il 17-22) and being combined with reverse osmosis (fig. 3) or electrodialysis (fig. 6). Embodiments with series of direct osmosis steps are further disclosed (fig. 12 and 14).
- 2.4 The present application does not meet the criteria of Article 33(1) PCT, because the subject-matter of claims 1-4, 7-9, 11-13, 15-17, 21 and 22 is not new in the sense of Article 33(2) PCT in the light of D2.
 D2 discloses the combination with a precipitation unit as solvent recovery step.
 For further details reference is made to the citation in the search report.
- 2.5 The present application does not meet the criteria of Article 33(1) PCT, because the subject-matter of claims 1-5, 7-13, 15-17, 19, 21 and 22 is not new in the sense of Article 33(2) PCT in the light of D5.
 D5 discloses a multi-step direct osmosis (cf. fig. 1 and 2) for the treatment of seawater or industrial wastewater using sucrose or salts as osmotic agents (p. 10, l. 23 p. 11, l. 2) combination with a precipitation unit as solvent recovery step. For further details reference is made to the citation in the search report.

Re Item VIII.

- The option "reverse osmosis" is listed twice in claim 3.
- Back references of claims 8, 11-14, 17, 19 and 20 are incorrect as they include references to both independent claims 1 and 7.
- iii The subject matter of claim 11 does not disclose a technical feature.

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY (SEPARATE SHEET)

WRIT

International application No.

PCT/GB2004/003242

iv The effect as described by the subject matter of claim 17 is inherently involved with the process of direct osmosis. The claimed subject matter thus is regarded to be a discovery.